G. R. S. 58
Previous references.

File No. 94-11

1911-2

Serial Nos. 1-7.

(Courts)

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-7

Part B. for July 1912

SUBJECT.

Rule of practice on the reception, admission and return of documents by civil courts.

Contents.

1. From the Regr. ch. ch. No 1148/11 of 4-9-11. Requests sanction for the issue of a Rule of practice on the subject.

2. To the Regr. ch. ch. No 9228 of 20-10-1911 Enquires whether the matter is one of practice & procedure and whether it is under section 130 of the new C.P.C. which the rule of practice is to be issued & requests to be intimated whether certain points referred to have been duly considered.

GPB.-8,000—7-4-07

Secretariat Remembrancer
27/4/12

3. From the Regr. ch. et — No 1760/138 dy 24-10-11,
States that the points referred to in Sls were duly considered & that the matter is one of practice and not of procedure. Also that the rules were made under section 130 of the CP-C and are based on the rules framed by the Justice Jones for the use of the Courts in the Central Provinces in 1896.

4. To the Regr. ch. et No g 2777 dated 21-3-12
Approves of the proposed rule of practice and authorises the chief court to cancel their circular letter No 213 dated 20-2-1909 with the remark that the proposal about the cancellation of Rule of Practice No 123 dy 17-10-1905 will form the subject of another communication

5. To the Regr ch. ct. No g 3429 dated 18-5-12.
Declines to sanction the abolition of the Skeleton form of judgments

6. From the Regr. ch. ct. No 4241/314 dy 21-5-12.
States that the retention of the said Rule of Practice entails a good deal of unnecessary labour on the clerk and suggests that at least so much of the Skeleton form which requires the reproduction in the judgment of all exhibits may, with advantage, be cancelled

7. To the Regr ch. ct. No g 182 dy 18-7-12
Sanctions the suggestion of the chief court with a slight variation.

G.R.S. 11] 1911-12

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(Courts)

NOTES.

Ct. File No. 94-11

FILE HEADING.

Rule of Practice on the reception, Admission and return of documents in Civil Courts

From The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

No. 1148/77 Dated 4-9-11. Received 6.9.11.

Diary No. 1689 | Enclos. one Spare Copies. | Serial No. 1

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Requests sanction for the issue of the accompanying Rule of Practice on the reception, admission and return of documents in Civil Courts.

NOTES AND ORDERS.

1

Subd. The proposed Rule of Practice is for the most part a Consolidation of the provisions contained in the Scattered Sections of the new Civil Pro. Code relating to documents.

P.J.O.

NOTES—First Sheet.

GPB—30,000—12-9-11

Serial No.

(2) In para (3) of the Covering letter it is at the same time proposed to cancel Rule of Practice N° 123 of 17.10.1905 prescribing the skeleton form of the Judgments of the Courts of first instance in original Civil Suits and also Circular letter of 20-2-1909 in regard to marking entries in account books produced in Courts Subs for orders.

P.

N

pl. 73+74 of the Civil Suits

H.C.J.-122
8-9-11.
S.N.(11)
9.9.11

Sanction may be accorded to the Rule of Practice proposed & to its repeal of R.P. no 123 & Circular letter no dated 20.2.09.

12/9/11.

302

2nd Q. 3)
Under what section of the Civil Procedure Code is this Rule of practice issued? Is it S. 130? Is the matter one of practice — not procedure?
4) If the r. P. about Form of judgments is abolished, I ~~fear~~ am afraid that the

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—55,000—27-4-09

Serial No.

judgments are likely to be
come erratic in character.
If rules 4 & 5 of Order XX
are the only guide, certain
matters on which informa
tion is now given in each
judgment will be left
out and one will have
to peruse the record
of proceedings to find out the
particulars. The new
rule about lists of docu
ments dispenses with the
necessity of entering details
about them in the Judgt.
5) The dates of filing the
plaint & written statts, the
number &c of adjts, & the
names of witnesses will
be left out.
6) It may be ascertained
whether these words have

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

Cb File No. 94 of 1911-12

Serial No.

been duly considered, and whether the Judges deliberately consider that these particulars are not required to be stated so as to be easily ~~known~~ gathered.

13/9/11

7 Put up draft Enquiring

8) Cb
Draft Subs.
HC-122
18-9-11

15/9/11

9) May be appd
20/9/11

10)
2nd) Draft appd by 2nd Committee
mtg
21.9.11

4) Issue
21/9/11

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

Serial No.

2 To the Registrar, chief Court J 1228 dy 20-10-11.

Inquires whether the matter is one of practice or procedure and whether it is under section 130 of the new civil Procedure Code. Then the rule of practice is to be issued and requests to be intimated whether certain points referred to have been duly considered.

3 From the Registrar, chief Court No 1710/138 dy 24-10-11

States that the points referred to in Cl 2 were duly considered and that the matter is one of practice and not of procedure. Also that the rules were made under section 130 of the C.P.C and ~~adapted~~ are based on the Rules framed by ~~the Chief Judge~~ Mr Justice Emery for the use of the Courts in the Central Provinces in 1896

Subd for orders.
SA-157
28-10-11 SW(11)

BT/28/10/11

2/H/11

376. 2nd (3) The rules may be sanctioned in accordance with the opinion of the Judges, though personally I am of the same opinion as already expressed.

14203/3.11.11

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

PLO Dewas GPB—55 H A1—27-4-09 2/11/11

2/11/11

R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat

C C File No. 94 of 19 11

Serial No.	
14	The proposed rules of practice regarding "Reception, Admission & Return of Documents" may be approved & printed at once, the Chief Court being authorised to withdraw & cancel their Circular No. 213 of 20 Feby. The Chief Court's 215 th After this we shall take up RP 123 of 1910-05 for which purpose please circulate to Council & bring up at next Meeting. 20 MR 12
16	Issue. Draft under as in para 1 supra & when ready file for circulation. 20.3.12
17	21/3/12 Subd. with a draft order. K.N. (123) 21.3.12 SN (11) 21/3/12
18	Issue 21.3.12.
	21/3/12 do.
4	The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore no. J 2777 of 21.3.12

Will be informed that their proposal about RP 123 will form the subject of another communication

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—50,000—12-8-10

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

~~Police~~ File No. 94 of 1911

Serial No.	
	Approved of the proposed rule of practice & authorises the Chief Court to cancel their circular letter no. 213 S 20.2.09 with the remark that the proposal about the cancellation of Rule of Practice no. 1238 S 17.10.05 will form the subject of another communication.
19	Subd. The file may now be sent to the Council Section for circulation.

K.N. (123) 23.3.12

20 yes 23.3.12

29/8/12

30/3/12

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GRB—20,000—20-1-12

7

Submitted to His Highness.

23

Paper under disposal

With his letter No.1148/77 dated 4th September 1911, the Registrar of the Chief Court submitted for the sanction of Government under Section 130 of the Civil Procedure Code, a Rule of Practice on the Reception ~~and~~ Admission and return of documents and proposed the cancellation of circular letter No.213 dated 20th February 1907 and the Rule of Practice No.123 dated 17th October 1905. The cancellation of circular letter No.213 would be consequential on the proposed Rule of Practice being approved. Not so that of the Rule of Practice No.123 dated 17th October 1905 which related to a totally different matter.

P.
N.

24 2. In Government Order No.J 2777/Cts.94-11-4 dated 21st March 1912, the issue of the proposed Rule of Practice was approved of and the Chief Court was authorized to cancel their circular letter No.213 dated 20th February 1908 which related to the marking of entries in accounts.

M.

25 3. The Rule of Practice No.123 dated 17th October 1905, the cancellation of which was also proposed by the Chief Court, relates to a skeleton form of judgment in original civil suits and the question of its abolition was reserved for further consideration.

26 4. The subject was discussed in Council in the

the light of the further remarks of the Chief Court conveyed in Registrar's letter No.1710/138 dated 24th October 1911. The Council think it to be desirable to retain the skeleton form of judgment and are unable to support the proposal of the Chief Court to cancel this Rule of Practice which prescribes it. The main reason is that while the form entails no appreciable labour it saves the risk of judgment becoming erratic in character as the First Councillor has well put it.

5. An extract from the Proceedings of the Council is hereto appended. The opinion of the Council may be accepted.

11

Record of Cases submitted for the Orders of His Highness the Maharaja

Subject.

Proposal of the Chief Court to cancel Rule of Practice No.123 of 17th October 1905 prescribing a skeleton form of judgment in original civil suits.

26.4.12
181

656 28

Order.

I agree with the Dewan.

~~KRM~~
30/4/12

29

4/5/12

III

Put up draft please

CSB
4/5/12

4/5/12

4/5/12

1i

. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CS File No. 94 of 1911

Serial No. 31

Subd. with a draft.

KN.(123) 7.5.12 SN(11) 8/5 32 attention is invited to the last para sentence in the draft, which may be omitted unless it is considered necessary to indicate the reason

9/5/12 SD

Sec'y 33 Issue

To Rule 20/5/12

CSR 14/5/12

SA 18/5/12

5 To the Registrar, Chief Court.
No. 3429 of 2777 of 18.5.12.
Declines to sanction the abolition of the Skeleton form of the Judgment.

6 From the Registrar, Chief Court.
No. 4247/314 dated 21.5.12.
States that the retention of the said Rule of Practice entails a good deal of unnecessary labour ~~on the~~

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GDB—20,000—20-1-12

J. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | Cls File No. 94 of 1911-12

Serial No.

on the Clerk, and suggests that at least so much of the Skeleton form which requires the reproduction in the Judgment of all exhibits may with advantage be cancelled.

34 Subs for orders with a copy of the R.P. recently issued regarding the reception &c. of documents.

Flag O

HCS-122
31.5.12.

35 Do It is not quite clear whether the word filed in R.P. 123 was intended to include documents not admitted as Evidence, this of course literally taken it does. In practice however it is usual to enter in the preamble only documents "filed as Evidence".

-x- It is the "Exhibits" that are spoken of as 'filed' in the R.P.

36 In view of paras 3 to 8 of the ~~recent~~ R.P. of 23rd March 1912, Enumeration of these documents in the preamble to the Judgment seems to be unnecessary and the suggestion of the Ch. Cl. may perhaps therefore be adopted

37 Agreed

1836
17-6-12

12/6/12

Dewan

16/6

16/6

17/6

2/6/12

Agreed

Mr. Justice

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—20,000—20-1-12

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat.

CS File No. 94 of 1911

Serial No.	
	the machine with the desired alterations made in it & adapt [illegible] searching. [illegible] 26/6/12
39	[illegible] [illegible] [illegible]

15

G. R. S. 12]

General and Revenue Secretariat. | CS File No. 94 of 1911-12

Serial No.

Shown to the Asstt Secy in reason for Orders to be issued:
Hon 12/7/12

43. Issue affn verification
[Let the C.S. show this to me before issue]
8th
6/7/12

Issue
13/7/12

B
13/7/12

7 To the Registrar, Chief Court
N.J. 1802 & 18.7.12.
Sanctions the suggestion of the Chief Court with a slight addition.

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

GPB—20,000—20-1-12

No. 1148/77 Jurisdiction

1

Bangalore dated, 4th September 1911.

From,

V.A.Rajaratna Mudaliar Esq.,
Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore.

To,

C.S.Balasundaram Iyer Esq.,
Offg: Secretary to Government,
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

I am directed by the Judges of the Chief Court to request that the Government may be pleased to sanction the issue of the accompanying Rule of Practice on the Reception, Admission and Return of Documents.

2. This is a subject in regard to which the procedure of Subordinate Courts is eminently unsatisfactory. In cases which come upon appeal, it is usually almost impossible to ascertain whether, and if so in what manner, any particular exhibit is proved.

3. Together with the issue of the Rule of Practice, Circular Letter No. 213 dated 20-2-'09 and Rule of Practice No.123 dated 17-10-'05 will be cancelled. The present objectionable system under which the preamble to every judgment is written by one of the clerks will be put a stop to and Judges will be allowed a freer hand so long as they conform

Reception, Admission and Return of Documents.

----0----

The provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure in regard to the reception and admission of documents in evidence are too often either entirely overlooked or very imperfectly complied with. It is often impossible to say what papers on the file constitute the true record. Copies of extracts from public or private records or accounts referred to in the judgment as having been ~~submitted~~ admitted in evidence are frequently incomplete and sometimes altogether wanting.

2. Documentary evidence may be conveniently grouped into three classes representing as many stages in the progress of a suit.

Class I. Documents upon which the plaintiff sues or relies.

By rule 14 of Order VII of the Code of Civil Procedure where a plaintiff sues upon a document, he must produce it with his plaint, and where he relies on any other document, he must ~~either~~ enter such document in a list to be attached to the plaint. By rule 18 of the same Order no document which has not been so produced or listed can be received in evidence without the leave of the Court.

Class II. Documents which become material upon the settlement of issues.

Rule

Rule I of Order XIII makes it incumbent on the parties to produce at the first hearing of the suit all documentary evidence on which they intend to rely and all documents which the Court has ordered to be produced.

Class III. Documents which become relevant during the course of a trial, e.g., previous statements put in to contradict or corroborate the testimony of a witness, documents handed to a witness to refresh his memory, documents filed for comparison of handwriting, etc.

3. All documents tendered in evidence shall be accompanied by a list in the following form (Civil Procedure Code, App. H. No. 5):-

List of documents produced by plff. (or deft).

(Title)

Number.	Description of document.	Date (if any) which the document bears.	Remarks.
1.	2.	3.	4.

Signature of party or pleader.....

Every Judicial Officer will provide himself with a rubber stamp of the following pattern:-

V

Suit No. of
Filed by on
.....

5

As soon as the list is filed, the particulars mentioned in clauses (a), (b) and (c) of rule 4 subrule (1) of Order XIII will be endorsed upon the back of each document. A specimen form of endorsement is appended.

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-1910.
Filed by plaintiff on 2nd August 09.

4. Before a document can be used as evidence it must be either proved or admitted in the manner prescribed by Chapter V of the Evidence Act. It may be pointed out that the expression "proved" as used in this Chapter does not mean conclusively proved, but proved unless and until disproved. The signature of a debtor on a bond is proved by the evidence of any person who deposes to having seen such signature made, and the bond being thus proved is admissible in evidence though the signature in question may subsequently be held to be a forgery. Similarly, a document purporting to be thirty years old which is produced from proper custody may be at once used in evidence though its genuineness may ultimately be disproved.

5. Rule 5 of Order XIII provides for the substitution of copies for originals in the case (1) of letter books or shop books or other accounts in current use, (2) of public records; and it gives precise instructions as to the manner in which these copies are to be examined, compared and certified. Whether these books, accounts or records are produced on behalf of a party or in obedience to an order of the Court acting of its own motion, a copy of those entries which are relevant to the case should invariably be required to be furnished so that the proceedings may be complete in themselves.

6

themselves.

6. In the case of any document which is considered by the Court to be inadmissible in evidence, the endorsements will be completed as under:-

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Rejected as filed too late.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Rejected as unproved.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Rejected as irrelevant.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

Documents tendered in evidence but rejected will be returned, either at once or at the conclusion of the trial, to the person by whom they were tendered, who will append his signature in column 4 of the list referred

7

referred to in paragraph 3 against each document so returned.

7. Immediately on a document being admitted in evidence, the endorsement already referred to will be completed and signed by the Judge. Specimen forms of completed endorsements are subjoined:-

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Attested.
Exhibit A.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Admitted by defendant.
Exhibit B.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

A.B. Vs C.D.
Suit No. 15 of 1909-10.
Filed by plff: on 2nd August 1909.
Public Document.
Exhibit C.
Dated 1st October 1909.
(Signature).
Judge.

When

8

When endorsements are stamped on an Exhibit, care should be taken to avoid defacing any written or printed matter.

8. Separate lists of the documents admitted in evidence on behalf of each party will be prepared in the following form:-

List of documents admitted in evidence for the plaintiff (or defendant).

Distinguishing letter or number.	Description of document.	Date of admission.	Remarks.
1.	2.	3.	4.

(Signature).

Judge.

Documents should be entered in these lists in the order in which they are admitted and marked. If any document has been admitted subject to objection, this fact should be noted in the column of remarks.

9. In marking documents letters may conveniently be used for the plaintiff, and numbers for the defendant. Thus the series of the plaintiff's exhibits will be A. B. C. etc., and of the defendant's exhibits I, II, III. Where defendants put in separate sets of Exhibits each series may be distinguished thus:- 1/I, 1/II, 1/III etc, 2/I, 2/II, 2/III, etc. Where a number of documents of the same nature are admitted, as for example

9

example, a series of entries in an account book or of receipts for rent, the whole series shpuld bear one letter or number, a small letter or small number being added to distinguish each paper of the series.

10. It is incumbent on a Court before proceeding to Judgment to finally revise the record on which such Judgment is to be based, to see that all documents which have been used as evidence are on the record and to return to the parties any papers still on the record which have not been admitted in evidence.

11. When documents are unnecessarily filed the costs incurred in connection therewith should ordinarily be thrown upon the party filing them, irrespective of the result of the suit.

12. The provisions for the return of documents admitted in evidence are contained in rule 9 of Order XIII. In cases in which an appeal is allowed by law, no document shall be returned until the period allowed for such appeal has elapsed and no appeal has been preferred, or until such appeal, if preferred, has been disposed of, unless the person applying for the return of such document delivers a certified copy to be substituted for the original. The return of any document should be noted in the list referred to in paragraph 8.

13. To every copy of a decree given to the parties to a suit or case there shall be annexed a printed notice in the following form, calling upon them to withdraw their Exhibits as soon as the decree shall have become final:—

Notices to take back documents.

10

Notices to take back documents.

In the Court of.....

Suit No..... of .....

.....Plaintiff.

.....Defendant.

The parties in the above suit are hereby required to take back as soon as the decree shall have become final, the documents produced by them which are exhibits in the above case. If they fail to take them back, the documents will be destroyed when the record is destroyed.

Dated.....

Judge.

Registrar

181

2½

1

2(9)(3)40

G.R.S. 26]

689

7

C5 File No. 94-11

Serial No. 2

Diary No. of letter replied to 689

No. J 1228

General and Revenue Secretariat

(C5)

, *the* 19 .

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore,

Date of issue 20-10-11.

Signed by [illegible]

Sir,

Adverting to your letter No 1148/177 dated the 4th September 1911, requesting ~~Sanction for the issue of~~ a ~~the proposed~~ Rule of Practice on the reception, Admission and return of documents, I am directed to enquire whether the matter is one of practice in procedure

over.

SUBJECT.

~~I would~~ and whether it is under
~~and that~~ section 130 of the
new Civil Proc Code
the said Rule of Practice is proposed to
be issued ~~and whether of Section~~ under.
~~130. Comes to~~ It is observed
that if the existing Rule
of Practice about the form
of Judgment ~~is~~ is abolished
there is the ~~fear~~ likelihood of
judgments becoming -
erratic in Character.
and if Rules 4 and 5
of order xx are the
only guide. Certain
matters on which
information is now
given in each judgment
will be left out and
~~one will have to peruse~~
the record of proceedings will have to be perused
for ~~to~~ finding out such particulars.
The new rule about the
lists of documents dispenses
with the necessity of
entering details about

List of enclosures,

Copied by

Examined by

GPB—20,000—25-9-10

G.R.S. 27]

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(*Continuation Sheet draft form.*)

them in the Judgments.

But ~~It is further observed~~ that the dates of filing the plaints and written Statements, the number of adjournments granted and the names of witnesses will also be left out.

I am to request you to be so good as to intimate whether these points have been duly considered and whether in the opinion of the Judges these particulars are not required to be stated in the Judgt so as to be easily gathered.

I have &c.

for Secy.

18/9/11

GPB—10,000—22-2-11

No: 1710/138.

Chief Court of Mysore,
Bangalore, 24th October 1911.

From

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to Government
General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to your No. J 1228 dated the 20th instant I am directed to say that the matter is one of practice not of procedure and that the rules are made under section 130 of the code.

2. I am further directed to say that the points referred to in your letter were duly considered before the rules were made. Mysore judgments at present consist of two parts, the first part written by a clerk and the second part by the Judge. It is proposed to put an end to this very objectionable practice and to put Mysore Judges on the same footing as Judges in British India.

3. The dates on which plaints and written statements were filed and the number of adjournments which were granted are very seldom relevant and can always be ascertained (if necessary) from the record.

4 A stereotyped form of judgment may have been very necessary some years back but it is altogether out of place in the present day. The result of prescribing

such a form has been (as already noted) that the writing up of the form is relegated to a ministerial official and that exhibits (whether proved or unproved) are admitted on the record as a matter of course. If left to themselves the Mounsiffs are perfectly capable of writing judgments in conformity with the requirements of the code.

5. I am directed to add that the rules now submitted for sanction are adapted from rules which were drafted by the Chief Judge for the use of the courts in the Central Provinces as far back as 1896 [C. P. Civil Circular I-7]. The introduction of these rules was found to be most beneficial.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
your most obedient servant,

A Mayall Mitchell
Registrar.

MB.

G.R.S. 28.]

File No. 94-11

Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to 1082

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

(45)

, *the* 19

Date of issue 21-3-12

Signed by Mr B. Narasimhaiengar

READ—

Letter no. 1148/77 & 4.9.11 from the Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore requesting sanction to issue a Rule of practice on the Reception, Admission and ~~ORDER THEREON. No.~~ Return of Documents in the civil Courts.

2. Correspondence ending Letter no. 1710/138 & 24.10.11 from the same officer stating in reply

over

SUBJECT.

GPB—10,000—19-4-10

to this office communication that the matter is one of practice, not of procedure & that the rules are made under Section 130 civil P. Code and are adapted from the rules which were drafted by the Chief Judge for the use of the Courts in the Central Provinces.

Order thereon: J 2777/C 594-114 of 21-3-12

Govt. are pleased to approve the proposed Rule of Practice regarding the Reception, Admission & Return of Documents in the civil Courts received with the letter read above & to authorise the Chief Court to withdraw & cancel their circular letter no. 218 B 20.2.09.

The proposal about the cancellation of Rule of Practice no. 128 B 17.10.05 will form the subject of another communication.

By.

For Secy to Govt.

do.

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore

K.N.(128) 21.3.12

21/3/12

1

18

G.R.S. 281 1082 / 1175

File No. 94-11

Serial No. 5

Diary No. of letter replied to

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(Courts)

the 19

Date of issue 18-5-12

Signed by M S Narayanaraya

READ— Govt. Proc. No. J 2777/ Ct 94-11-4 & 21st March 1912 reserving for further consideration the cancellation of Rule of Practice no. 123 & 17th October 1905 prescribing a skeleton form of judgment in original civil Suits. Order thereon: No. J 3429 On a careful consideration of the question

over.

~~ORDER THEREON.~~ — No.

SUBJECT.

GPB—10,000-29-9-10

Copy sent

Consider
Govt. ~~think~~ that it is desirable to
retain the skeleton form of judgment,
~~that they are~~ Sanctioned
and ~~are~~ Regret, therefore, unable to ~~support~~
the proposal of the Chief Court to
~~rej~~ cancel the Rule of Practice
referred to above, ~~which prescribes~~
~~it.~~ ~~The main reason is that, while~~
The form entails no appreciable
labour, while it saves the risk of judgments
becoming erratic.

may be omitted

SW(111)
8/5/12

For Secy to Govt.

do. The Registrar, Chief Court of
Mysore.

KW(123)
7.5.12

J 3446

20

Chief Court of Mysore,

Bangalore, dated 21st May 1912.

No. 4247/314

22

Courts File Page 4 & N. 6

From

The Registrar of the
Chief Court of Mysore.

To

The Secretary to the Government of Mysore,
General and Revenue Departments.

S i r,

Adverting to Proceedings of Government No. J. 3429/Cts. 94-11-5 dated the 18th Instant stating that Government do not consider it desirable to cancel Rule of Practice No. 123 dated 17th October 1905, I am directed to point out that if the Rule of Practice is retained in its entirety an immense amount of unnecessary labour will be entailed on the clerk who writes the first part of judgment. Under the said Rule of Practice all exhibits filed by either party have to be enumerated in the judgment regardless of the fact of their being admitted or rejected. Under Rule of Practice No. 151 dated 23rd March 1912 all documents admitted in evidence for either party are enumerated in lists for the correctness of which the Judge is responsible. I am to suggest that if it is thought undesirable to do away altogether with the skeleton form of judgment so much at least of that ~~from~~ form which requires

requires the reproduction in the judgment of all exhibits filed by either party may with advantage be cancelled.

I have the honour to be,

S i r,

Your most obedient servant,

Registrar.

N.G.

G.R.S. 28.]

File No. 94-11.
Serial No. 7

Diary No. of letter replied to

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

( )

the 19

Date of issue 18-7-12

Signed by [illegible] S. Hiriyannaiya

READ--

Correspondence ending with letter No. 4247/314 dated the 21st May 1912, from the Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore, stating that the for reasons ~~hereinafter~~ explained, the

ORDER THEREON.—No.

Chief Court suggest the cancellation of so much of the Skeleton form of the Judgment, prescribed by Rule of

over

SUBJECT.

GPB—10,000—19-4-10.

Rule of Practice N° 123 dated N°
the 17th October 1905, which
requires the reproduction
in the Judgment of all
exhibits filed by either ~~of the~~ party to
~~parties~~ to a Suit.

Order thereon N:- J182/ch594-11-4 Encl 1 & 18-7-12

The ~~Registrar~~ Suggestion
of the Chief Court contained
in the Registrar's letter
referred to above is
approved. The Chief Court
is requested to issue the
necessary Correction Slips
accordingly.

With a slight
modification
in the shape of
a short note added
as shown on the
accompanying
Spare copy —

Secretary
22

To

The Registrar, Chief Court of Mysore

1
4/July 12

DFG
Hcs 122
22-6-12